

REMARKS

General remarks

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Official Action in the present application. The present amendment is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner in the Office Action mailed September 30, 2005, and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of all claims under consideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 - 10 are pending in the application. Claim 5 is currently amended with the self-explanatory amendments seen above and contains no new matter.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner is unable to access or open the references in the March 4, 2005 Information Disclosure Statement by eDAN system, and has not considered those references as to the merits. The March 4, 2005 Information Disclosure Statement contains two U.S. patents and a non patent literature document. The two U.S. patents should be readily available to the Examiner and Applicant has no duty to submit copies of U.S. patents in information disclosure statement. Applicant will resubmit a copy of the non patent literature document, titled Service Loading.

Amendment to the Specification

The Examiner states that Gateway 16 should be Gateway 116 in page 5, line 1 of the Specification. Applicant has amended the specification accordingly.

Claim Rejections

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Vaios (U.S. Patent 6,271,752). Claims 1-2, 4, 6-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios. Claims 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios in view of Menard et al. (U.S. Patent 6,608,557¹, hereinafter “Menard”).

Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejection as applied to each rejected claim.

Vaios describes a security surveillance system comprised of a camera with motion sensor, a local computer system, a remote computer system and communications devices. When the motion sensor detects an obstruction, it triggers an alarm to wake up the local computer and the video camera starts recording and transmits the recorded data to the local computer. The local computer then notifies a remote individual via E-mail, a telephone call or a beeper message. The remote individual then uses the remote computer and communication devices to access information stored in the local computer.

Menard describes a system which sends a message to alert a central station of an alarm event at a premise.

With reference to claim 5, the claim has been amended and now contains at least the following distinguishing recitation:

¹ In the claim rejection, the Examiner provided U.S. 6,608,577 as the patent number to Menard et al. Office Action, page 8, paragraph 7. In the Notice of Reference Cited, Menard is given the patent number of U.S. 6,608,557. Applicant believes that the latter is correct because the first inventor of U.S. 6,608,577 is not Menard whereas the first inventor of U.S. 6,608,557 is.

a wireless module being coupled to the sensor means, the sensor means being adapted to provide a signal containing data being indicative of the occurrence of the event to the wireless module in response to the occurrence of the event,

In making the rejection, the Examiner asserts that the local computer in Vaios corresponds to the claimed wireless module and that such a local computer communicates to a sensor. To the extent Vaios discloses communication between the local computer and the sensor, it only describes a motion sensor alarm that wakes up the local computer previously idle in sleep mode when the motion sensor detects an obstruction. *See* col. 8, lines 37-44, and fig. 4. Vaios does not teach or suggest the sensor being adapted to provide a signal *containing data being indicative of the occurrence of the event* to the local computer, which allegedly corresponds to a wireless module. Therefore, Vaios does not teach or suggest each feature of claim 5. Applicant respectfully submits that the anticipation rejection of claim 5 should be withdrawn.

With reference to claim 1, the Examiner suggests that Vaios discloses each feature except first gateway, second gateway, first hypertext and second hypertext. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 1 recites, “determining at least one receiver address for the first hypertext transfer protocol request by the server.” In Vaios, when a motion sensor alarm is triggered, the local computer sends a notification to the remote individual via a beeper message, a telephone call or an e-mail message. *See* col. 8, lines 37-60. It appears that the address for the remote individual is stored in the local computer. Nothing in the Vaios reference, teaches or suggests determining a receiver’s address for a hypertext transfer protocol request by a server.

Additionally, claim 1 includes, "sending of a wireless application protocol service loading message to at least one receiver which corresponds to the at least one receiver address from the gateway." Nothing in the Vaios reference, discusses service loading message, let alone teaching or suggesting "sending of a wireless application protocol service loading message to at least one receiver which corresponds to the at least one receiver address from the gateway," as recited in claim 1. For these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the obviousness rejection of claim 1 over Vaios should be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 4 patentable at least by virtue of their dependency. Claims 6-8 and 10 are patentable for analogous reasons submitted for claim 1.

Claim 3 is patentable at least because it is dependent from claim 1 and because Menard does not remedy the deficiencies of Vaios.

Claim 9 is patentable because it includes analogous features of claim 1 and because Menard does not remedy the deficiencies of Vaios.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Patent Application No.: 10/791,887

Attorney Docket No.: Q80115

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Kelly G. Hyndman
Registration No. 39,234

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 2, 2005